WRITTEN ACTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCH OFFICE (SUPPLEMENTARY PAGE)   Intern. File No.PCT/DE2004/001779

1.   Reference is made to the following document:

     D1: U.S.-B-6,615,3661 (GROCHOWSKI EDWARD T ET AL), September 2, 2003 (2003-09-02)

2.   **Re Section V**

     Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step, and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting this statement

2.1   The present application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 33(1) PCT, because the subject matter of Claims 1, 11 and 23 is not novel within the meaning of Article 33(2) PCT.

     Document D1 discloses a method for operand processing in a processing unit, and the corresponding device and processing unit. This processing unit has two execution units (execution cores 110(a) and 110(b)) and may be switched between a first operating mode (high reliability mode HR) and a second operating mode (high performance mode HP) (cf. column 2, lines 27 - 30).

     In the first operating modes both execution units are supplied the same operands and both execution units are triggered by identical control signals for the processing of the operands (column 2, lines 32 - 34).

     In the second operating modes both execution units are supplied different operands and both execution units are triggered by different control signals for the processing of the operands (column 2, lines 34 - 36).

2.2   Dependent Claims:

     EV322953262

The dependent claims do not include any features that, in combination with the features of any claim to which they relate, satisfy the requirements of the PCT with regard to novelty and inventive activity.

D1 discloses the features of Claims 5 – 10, 14, 15 and 18 – 22 (cf. the corresponding text passages indicated in the search report).

A second, faster cycle is not expressly described in D1, but appears to be obvious since twice as many operands are able to be processed using two independent execution units.

3. **Comment**

The application does not satisfy the requirements of Article 6 PCT, because Claim 24 is not clear. Claim 24 is imcomplete.